

06-05-00

A

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILINGAttorney Docket No. NAI1P002/00.056.01

First Named Inventor:

Lee Benzinger et al.

This transmittal and the documents and/or fees itemized hereon and attached hereto have been deposited as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" in accordance with 37 CFR §1.10 with Mailing Label

Number EK858793209US**UTILITY PATENT APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL (37 CFR § 1.53(b))**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Box Patent Application

Washington, DC 20231

☐ Duplicate for  
fee processing

Sir: This is a request for filing a patent application under 37 CFR § 1.53(b) in the name of inventors:  
Lee Benzinger et al.

**For: SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR DYNAMIC SYSTEM  
ADAPTATION USING CONTRACTS**

Application Elements:

- ☒ 18 Pages of Specification, Claims and Abstract  
☒ 6 Sheets of Drawings  
☒ 2 Pages Combined Declaration and Power of Attorney

Accompanying Application Parts:

- ☒ Assignment and Assignment Recordation Cover Sheet (recording fee of **\$40.00** enclosed)  
☐ 37 CFR 3.73(b) Statement by Assignee  
☐ Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449  
☐ Copies of IDS Citations  
☐ Preliminary Amendment  
☒ Return Receipt Postcard  
☐ Small Entity Statement(s)  
☐ Other:

Fee Calculation (37 CFR § 1.16)

	(Col. 1)	(Col. 2)	<u>SMALL ENTITY</u>		<b>OR</b>	<u>LARGE ENTITY</u>	
	<u>NO. FILED-</u>	<u>NO. EXTRA</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>FEE</u>		<u>RATE</u>	<u>FEE</u>
BASIC FEE			\$345		OR	\$690	\$690
TOTAL CLAIMS	<u>20</u>	-20 = <u>0</u>	x09 = \$		OR	x18 = \$	
INDEP CLAIMS	<u>03</u>	-03 = <u>0</u>	x39 = \$		OR	x78 = \$	
[ ] Multiple Dependent Claim Presented			\$130 = \$		OR	\$260 = \$	
* If the difference in Col. 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in Col. 2.			Total \$		OR	Total	<u>\$690</u>

05/31/00  
 Jc406U  
 PTO

Jc511 U.S. PTO  
 09/586550  
 05/31/00

09/586550  
 05/31/00

☒ Check No. 118 in the amount of **\$730.00** is enclosed.

☒ The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees beyond the amount enclosed which may be required, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P002/00.056.01).

General Authorization for Petition for Extension of Time (37 CFR §1.136)

☒ Applicants hereby make and generally authorize any Petitions for Extensions of Time as may be needed for any subsequent filings. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any extension fees under 37 CFR §1.17 as may be needed to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P002/00.056.01).

☒ Please send correspondence to the following address:

Send Correspondence To: **Kevin J. Zilka**  
**P.O. BOX 721030**  
**San Jose, California 95172-1030**

Direct Telephone Calls To: **Kevin J. Zilka at telephone number (408) 505-5100**

Date: May 31, 2000

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Kevin J. Zilka**  
Registration No. 41,429

DOCKET No.  
NAI1P002/00.056.01

U.S. PATENT APPLICATION  
FOR  
SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER  
PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR DYNAMIC  
SYSTEM ADAPTATION USING CONTRACTS

INVENTORS: Richard J. Feiertag  
Lee Benzinger  
Jaisook Rho

ASSIGNEE: NETWORK ASSOCIATES, INC.

KEVIN J. ZILKA  
PATENT AGENT  
P.O. Box 721030  
SAN JOSE, CA 95172

# SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR DYNAMIC SYSTEM ADAPTATION USING CONTRACTS

Richard J. Feiertag  
Lee Benzinger  
Jaisook Rho

5

## GOVERNMENT LICENSE RIGHTS

10       The present invention was made with Government support under contract  
#F30602-97-C-0187 awarded by USAF, AFMC, Rome Laboratory, Directorate of  
Contracting/PKRZ, 26 Electronic Parkway, Rome, NY 13441-4514. The  
Government has certain rights in the invention.

15

## FIELD OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to networks, and more particularly to dynamically  
adapting network operation.

20

## BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Systems are very dynamic in that users of the system and devices attached  
thereto often change on a regular basis. Further, software executed on the system  
often gets modified and/or updated, and loads on the system periodically fluctuate.

25   There is thus a well established problem of adapting to the ever changing needs of a  
system.

System adaptation may be required for a number of reasons, both innocent  
and ill-willed. For example, adaptation may be necessary due to a system being

under attack by a hacker, changing system policy, fluctuating system resource utilization, varying availability of different system resources, and/or changing system performance constraints. Preferably, the approach to adaptation is automated as much as possible so as to effect fluid operation as the system adapts to changing  
5 conditions.

In some cases, such automation is handled by algorithms used for scheduling the adaptation of various computer resources. Most resource scheduling algorithms are heuristic, i.e. they are based on rules of thumb. This technique generally works  
10 well, but often performs poorly when conditions get out of an expected range, or when the system changes unexpectedly. Unfortunately, modern systems change quite often. For example, in a computer network, a set of computer systems communicate with each other via a high speed connection, and the makeup of the system may be in a constant state of flux, as individual computer systems are  
15 connected to and disconnected from the network system, and interoperate in various fashions.

In addition to the changes in the computer system configuration, there is also the issue of a constantly changing system workload. The system workload is the  
20 combination of all of the work which various components of the system are processing. This system workload changes periodically with the time of day, day of week, and even the time of year, and may also change permanently over time. It is extremely difficult to derive a set of rules or heuristics for resource allocation which anticipates all of these variations in operating conditions.

25

Changes in a system are thus unpredictable and may occur unexpectedly in real-time. In order to effectively initiate and achieve adaptation, human intervention is often required. As the system changes, a human operator is often relied upon to assess the status of the system, and implement various algorithms or the like for  
30 adapting the system to meet the needs of the various components thereof. Unfortunately, this is very cumbersome and subject to error, resulting in a failure to

5

**DISCLOSURE OF THE INVENTION**

5 A system, method and computer program product are provided for dynamic  
adaptation of a system in accordance with a contract with criteria associated  
therewith. During operation, an interaction between a plurality of components of a  
system is governed utilizing the criteria of the contract. Further, it is determined  
whether the interaction between the components of the system meets the criteria of  
the contract. Upon the criteria of the contract not being met, the interaction between  
10 the components of the system is adapted to conform to the criteria.

In a preferred embodiment, the interaction between the components of the  
system is adapted by adjusting the contract. As an option, the contract may be  
adjusted using numerous methods. For example, such methods may include  
15 deactivation of the contract, modification of the contract, deletion of the contract,  
and/or activation of a different contract.

In another preferred embodiment, the criteria of the contract may include cost  
model criteria. Such cost model criteria may be based on resource utilization,  
20 performance, service provisioning, etc. Further, the interaction that is governed and  
adapted among the components may be security-related interaction, performance-  
related interaction, and/or interaction relative to any other aspect of systems that  
affects the cost model criteria.

25

### **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS**

Figure 1 shows an exemplary system with a plurality of components in  
5 accordance with a preferred embodiment;

Figure 2 shows a representative hardware environment for the various  
components of Figure 1;

10 Figure 3 shows steps taken for dynamic adaptation of a system in accordance  
with a contract having criteria associated therewith;

Figure 4 shows one example of creating a contract between the components  
of the system;

15 Figure 5 shows the manner in which the interaction between the components  
of the system is adapted to conform to the criteria; and

Figure 6 shows an exemplary implementation of a preferred embodiment.

20



### DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

A dynamic, automated method is provided for adapting an interaction  
5 between various components of a system in order to continuously meet system and  
component requirements in real-time or near real-time. In order to accomplish this,  
the interaction between components is governed by contracts. These contracts utilize  
criteria, e.g. cost criteria, to determine that the component interaction meets the  
contract. During operation, the interaction between the components of the system is  
10 automatically adapted to meet the criteria of the contracts.

Figure 1 illustrates an exemplary system 100 with a plurality of components  
102 in accordance with a preferred embodiment. As shown, such components  
include a network 104 which take any form including, but not limited to a local area  
15 network, a wide area network such as the Internet, etc. Coupled to the network 104  
is a plurality of computers which may take the form of desktop computers 106, lap-  
top computers 108, hand-held computers 110, or any other type of computing  
hardware/software 111. As an option, the various computers may be connected to  
the network 104 by way of a server 112 which may be equipped with a firewall for  
20 security purposes. It should be noted that any other type of hardware or software  
may be included in the system and be considered a component 102 thereof.

A representative hardware environment associated with the various  
components of Figure 1 is depicted in Figure 2. In the present description, the  
25 various sub-components of each of the components 102 may also be considered  
components 102 of the system 100. For example, particular software modules  
executed on any component 102 of the system 100 may also be considered  
components 102 of the system 100. Figure 2 illustrates a typical hardware  
configuration of a workstation in accordance with a preferred embodiment having a  
30 central processing unit 210, such as a microprocessor, and a number of other units

interconnected via a system bus 212. The workstation shown in Figure 2 includes a Random Access Memory (RAM) 214, Read Only Memory (ROM) 216, an I/O adapter 218 for connecting peripheral devices such as disk storage units 220 to the bus 212, a user interface adapter 222 for connecting a keyboard 224, a mouse 226, a speaker 228, a microphone 232, and/or other user interface devices such as a touch screen (not shown) to the bus 212, communication adapter 234 for connecting the workstation to a communication network 235 (e.g., a data processing network) and a display adapter 236 for connecting the bus 212 to a display device 238.

The workstation may have resident thereon an operating system such as the Microsoft Windows NT or Windows/95 Operating System (OS), the IBM OS/2 operating system, the MAC OS, or UNIX operating system. It will be appreciated that a preferred embodiment may also be implemented on platforms and operating systems other than those mentioned. A preferred embodiment may be written using JAVA, C, and/or C++ language, or other programming languages along with an object oriented programming methodology. Object oriented programming (OOP) has become increasingly used to develop complex applications.

Figure 3 is a flowchart illustrating a method 300 for dynamic adaptation of a system in accordance with a contract having criteria associated therewith. Such criteria of the contract may be based on various models. For example, the criteria of the contract may be based on a cost model. The cost model criteria may relate to resource utilization. In just one example, such cost model criteria may represent some percentage of resource utilization, or an amount of load on the system. In yet another embodiment, the cost model criteria may relate to performance, i.e. performance degradation. For example, such criteria may include a minimal speed parameter value. Still yet another example of cost model criteria may include provisioning of service. It should be understood that the cost model criteria may be based on any parameter representing a system aspect that is of value to the user. In each of the above examples, levels, standards and/or specifications associated with

the criteria may be predetermined and saved for reasons that will soon become apparent.

As an option, a set of contracts may govern the interaction between any plurality of components. In this case, each contract of the set has unique criteria associated therewith. In such embodiment, each contract of the set may include criteria indicating which other contract of the set should be implemented upon a condition being met. In one example, such condition may include the satisfaction and/or failure of the system to meet the contract criteria.

As shown in Figure 3, it is first determined in decision 301 whether there a contract exists. If not, a contract is created in operation 302. The initial formation of the contract(s) may be carried out in various ways. For instance, the components or the management entities for the components may be permitted to negotiate the criteria. In real-time or near real-time systems, control entities may be permitted to negotiate the criteria. This negotiation may be accomplished by any desired method one example of which will be set forth in greater detail during reference to Figure 4.

During operation 303, an interaction between the components of the system is governed utilizing the criteria of the contract. In particular, the system and components are governed or controlled in a constant effort to meet the criteria of the contract. While the interaction is being governed in operation 303, it is possible that the interaction may terminate. Conditions for determination of interaction termination 304 may be implemented as part of the conditions of the criteria of the contract. Conditions for determination of interaction termination 304 may also be implemented within the management and control structure for the components. In either case, when a determination is made that in 304 that the components are no longer interacting, the method 300 is ended.

With continuing reference to Figure 3, it is determined in decision 306 whether the interaction between the components of the system meets the criteria of

the contract. This may be accomplished by monitoring various system parameters from which it can be determined whether the criteria are met. Upon it being determined in decision 306 that the criteria of the contract are not being met, the interaction between the components of the system is automatically adapted to conform to the criteria. Note operation 308. It should be understood that any one of the components of the system may be designated to carry out such adaptation. Additional detail will be set forth regarding the system adaptation of operation 308 in Figure 5.

10 In a preferred embodiment, the interaction between the components of the system is adapted by adjusting the contract, thus altering the criteria. As an option, the contract may be adjusted using numerous methods. For example, such methods may include deactivation of the contract, modification of the contract, deletion of the contract, and/or activation of a different contract. After system adaptation, the interaction between the components of the system is governed utilizing the new criteria of the adjusted contract, as set forth in operation 303.

Figure 4 is a flowchart illustrating one example of creating a contract between the components of the system in accordance with operation 302 of Figure 3.

20 First, in operation 400, a requesting component of the system advertises its capability to a control component which handles contract negotiations. Thereafter, in operation 402, the control component sends the requesting component a proposed contract based on the capability and any other pertinent factors. As an option, the control component may choose a contract from a predetermined set. If the requesting component does not accept, the process is terminated and interaction is prohibited.

Upon the requesting component accepting the proposed contract, the control module sends a seal message to the requesting component thereby completing the contract negotiation. Note operation 404. As an option, the control module may also generate a fallback proposed contract and send the same to the requesting

component, as indicated in operation 406. Upon receipt, the requesting component verifies the fallback proposed contract in operation 408. Again, in operation 410, the control module sends a seal message completing the fallback contract negotiation. It should be noted that the fallback contract is stored, but not activated, for use in case the first contract requires a replacement. This replacement can occur when the interaction governed by the first contract no longer meets the criteria of the cost model.

Another exemplary contract(s) negotiation scheme that is derived from the principles set forth herein may be found with reference to "Intrusion Detection Inter-Component Adaptive Negotiation" by Lee Benzinger et al. which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

Figure 5 is a flowchart illustrating the manner in which the interaction between the components of the system is adapted to conform to the criteria in accordance with operation 308 of Figure 3. As shown, it is first determined how the system is to adjust the contract to achieve system adaptation. Note decision 500. This may be indicated within the contract under which components are currently operating or by another desired means. Based on the results of decision 500, a preferred embodiment may be capable of performing various functions.

In operation 502, the contract may be adjusted by simply deactivating the contract. In the alternative, the contract may be deleted in operation 504. Of course, the deactivation or deletion of the contract would not provide any means of continuing interaction, thus terminating the same. Still yet, the contract may be modified in operation 506. Such may include modification of the criteria by a predetermined formula, negotiation between parties, or any other desired means. As yet another option, a different contract, i.e. the fallback contract, may be executed in operation 508. Selection of the existing contract may be accomplished by simply selecting a separate contract stored in a database.

Figure 6 is a schematic diagram illustrating an exemplary implementation of a preferred embodiment. Such example is set forth in the context of handling security-related events in a system via interaction and adaptation between the various components. In particular, the present example features how the system of a preferred embodiment may react to an intrusion by a hacker. It should be noted, however, that a preferred embodiment may be implemented to interact and adapt in response to any type of event, or even general aspects of the system.

As shown in Figure 6, a plurality of components is interconnected in a manner similar to that shown in Figure 1. In particular, a lap-top computer 600 is coupled to a local area network (LAN) 602 via the Internet 604. A firewall 606 is coupled between the Internet 604 and the LAN 602. The LAN 602 includes a pair of intrusion detection modules 608 and an analysis module 610. Prior to use, a set of contracts is established for each of the components of the LAN 602, the firewall 606 and the analysis module 610.

During use, such contracts dictate the manner in which the components of the LAN 602 and the firewall 606 interact and adapt to changing network conditions, as set forth earlier during reference to Figure 3. In particular, the intrusion detection modules 608 are capable of communicating information being sent to and received from components behind and beyond the firewall 606 for the purposes of detecting intrusions and anomalies in the system.

In order to communicate information to and from other components in the system, the intrusion detection modules 608 and any other system component periodically send and receive generalized intrusion detection objects (GIDOS) which are data structures with information that may include, but not be limited to IP addresses of sources of the information, a timestamp indicating when the information was generated, an identifier of a host machine from which the information is received, a descriptor (an attack code) of a particular intrusion on the system that has been detected, and/or a user name of the entity which sent or

received information. It should be understood that any type of data structure may be employed in lieu of GIDOS. For more general information on GIDOS, protocols, and other concepts derived from the principles set forth herein, reference should be made to “Gido Filtering Requirements and Design” by Stuart Staniford-Chen, and  
5 “IDIAN Protocol Design Version 1” by Lee Benzinger et al. which are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety.

The GIDOS are sent back and forth between the intrusion detection modules  
608 and any other components through the analysis module 610. The analysis  
10 module 610 also has access to the contracts associated with each of the components of the system. Given the information supplied by the GIDOS, the analysis module 610 may thus govern the interaction between the intrusion detection modules 608 and any other components in order to ensure that the criteria of the contracts are met. If they are not, the analysis module 610 may adapt the interaction by adjusting the  
15 contracts in a manner set forth hereinabove during reference to Figure 3.

In the present scenario, the lap-top computer 600 is employed by a traveling user to interact with the various components of the LAN 602. Further, the lap-top computer 600 is compromised by a hacker who wishes to infiltrate the system.  
20 Initially, the lap-top computer 600 may communicate with the analysis module 610 in order to establish, i.e. negotiate, etc., a contract(s) dictating criteria for interaction therewith.

In order to infiltrate the system, a distributed denial of service attack is  
25 executed by the lap-top computer 600. Such denial of service attack may include any method that overuses the resources of the system, thus compromising operability. In the present example, this is accomplished by overloading the intrusion detection modules 608 with GIDOS.

30 In response to the large influx of GIDOS, the analysis module 610 monitors whether it violates the criteria. In the case where the analysis module 610 utilizes a

contract having cost model-based criteria, a predetermined maximum load amount of GIDOS/sec may be used as a trigger point to initiate system adaptation. It should be appreciated that such maximum load amount may be associated with the system as a whole, or with each of the components of the system individually. In order to  
5 determine whether or not the maximum load amount has been reached, the various components of the system are adapted to communicate current load amounts, in addition to any other necessary parameters, to the analysis module 610 using GIDOS. Of course, the maximum load amounts are set to ensure that enough system operability is maintained in order to allow communication of GIDOS for adaptation  
10 purposes.

Assuming that such maximum amount has been reached, the analysis module 610 may adapt the system per the terms of the contract. For example, if the GIDOS identify the lap-top computer 600 as performing a suspect attack, the contract  
15 associated with the lap-top computer 600 may be adjusted to restrict access to system resources. In a preferred embodiment, a fallback contract may be used which was negotiated before the lap-top computer 600 was permitted to use the system. In cases where there is a plurality of components such as the lap-top computer 600, the analysis module 610 may optionally adjust contracts of all of the components of the  
20 system in order to restrict access to system resources.

If after the system operates under the adjusted contract the system stabilizes to an acceptable level, the fallback contract may dictate that the original contract be reactivated in place of the fallback contract. If this results in a situation where the  
25 system is again under attack, the contract may then indicate that the lap-top computer 600 is most likely performing a forbidden attack, and the firewall 606 may be used to prevent any further communication with the Internet 604. In the alternative, the contract associated with the lap-top computer 600 may be deactivated or deleted.

30



The foregoing example is set forth in the context of handling security-related events by allowing such events to operate as a trigger for system adaptation.

Additional details on the above example which were derived from the principles set forth herein may be found with reference to “Intrusion Detection Inter-Component

5 Adaptive Negotiation” by Lee Benzinger et al. which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety. It should be noted, however, that a preferred embodiment may be implemented to interact and adapt in response to any type of event, or in response to general system conditions rather than any particular event.

10 While various embodiments have been described above, it should be understood that they have been presented by way of example only, and not limitation. Thus, the breadth and scope of a preferred embodiment should not be limited by any of the above-described exemplary embodiments, but should be defined only in accordance with the following claims and their equivalents.

15

CLAIMS

What is claimed is:

- 1 1. A method for dynamic adaptation of a system in accordance with a contract  
2 with criteria associated therewith, comprising the steps of:
  - 3 (a) governing an interaction between a plurality of components of the system  
4 utilizing the criteria of the contract;
  - 5 (b) determining whether the interaction between the components of the system  
6 meets the criteria of the contract; and
  - 7 (c) adapting the interaction between the components of the system upon the  
8 criteria of the contract not being met.
- 1 2. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the interaction between the  
2 components of the system is adapted by adjusting the contract.
- 1 3. The method as recited in claim 2, wherein the contract is adjusted by a  
2 method selected from the group consisting of deactivation of the contract,  
3 modification of the contract, deletion of the contract, and activation of a  
4 different contract.
- 1 4. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the criteria of the contract include  
2 cost model criteria.
- 1 5. The method as recited in claim 4, wherein the cost model criteria is based on  
2 resource utilization.
- 1 6. The method as recited in claim 4, wherein the cost model criteria are based  
2 on performance.

1 7. The method as recited in claim 4, wherein the cost model criteria is based on  
2 service provisioning.

1 8. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the interaction that is governed  
2 and adapted is security-related interaction.

1 9. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein the components include an  
2 intrusion detection module and an analysis module.

1 10. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the interaction that is governed  
2 and adapted is performance-related interaction.

1 11. A computer program product for dynamic adaptation of a system in  
2 accordance with a contract with criteria associated therewith, comprising:  
3 (a) computer code for governing an interaction between a plurality of  
4 components of the system utilizing the criteria of the contract;  
5 (b) computer code for determining whether the interaction between the  
6 components of the system meets the criteria of the contract; and  
7 (c) computer code for adapting the interaction between the components of the  
8 system upon the criteria of the contract not being met.

1 12. The computer program product as recited in claim 11, wherein the interaction  
2 between the components of the system is adapted by adjusting the contract.

1 13. The computer program product as recited in claim 12, wherein the contract is  
2 adjusted by a method selected from the group consisting of deactivation of  
3 the contract, modification of the contract, deletion of the contract, and  
4 activation of a different contract.

1 14. The computer program product as recited in claim 11, wherein the criteria of  
2 the contract includes cost model criteria.

- 1 15. The computer program product as recited in claim 14, wherein the cost  
2 model criteria is based on resource utilization.
- 1 16. The computer program product as recited in claim 14, wherein the cost  
2 model criteria is based on performance.
- 1 17. The computer program product as recited in claim 14, wherein the cost  
2 model criteria is based on service provisioning.
- 1 18. The computer program product as recited in claim 11, wherein the interaction  
2 that is governed and adapted is security-related interaction.
- 1 19. The computer program product as recited in claim 18, wherein the  
2 components include an intrusion detection module and an analysis module.
- 1 20. An apparatus for dynamic adaptation of a system in accordance with a  
2 contract with criteria associated therewith, comprising:  
3 (a) logic for governing an interaction between a plurality of components of the  
4 system utilizing the criteria of the contract;  
5 (b) logic for determining whether the interaction between the components of the  
6 system meets the criteria of the contract; and  
7 (c) logic for adapting the interaction between the components of the system upon  
8 the criteria of the contract not being met.

## SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR DYNAMIC SYSTEM ADAPTATION USING CONTRACTS

### ABSTRACT

A system, method and computer program product are provided for dynamic adaptation of a system in accordance with a contract with criteria associated therewith. During operation, an interaction between a plurality of components of a system is governed utilizing the criteria of the contract. Further, it is determined whether the interaction between the components of the system meets the criteria of the contract. Upon the criteria of the contract not being met, the interaction between the components of the system is adapted to conform to the criteria.




Figure 1




Figure 2




FIGURE 3






FIGURE 4

FIG. 5 is a flowchart illustrating a process for adjusting a contract. The process begins with a 'STAND' state, leading to a decision point 'HOW TO ADJUST CONTRACT?'. From this decision, four paths emerge: 'DEACTIVATION OF THE CONTRACT', 'MODIFICATION OF THE CONTRACT', 'DELETION OF THE CONTRACT', and 'ACTIVATION OF A DIFFERENT EXISTING CONTRACT'. Each path leads to a corresponding action block, which then leads to an 'END' state. Reference numerals 500, 502, 506, 504, and 508 are used to identify specific elements in the flowchart.

308





FIGURE 5



**FIGURE 6**

DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY  
FOR ORIGINAL U.S. PATENT APPLICATION

Attorney's Docket No. NAI1P002/00.056.01

As a below-named inventor, I hereby declare that:

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name.

I believe that I am the original, first and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled:  
SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR DYNAMIC SYSTEM ADAPTATION USING  
CONTRACTS, the specification of which,

- (check one)
1. ☒ is attached hereto.
2. ☐ was filed on \_\_\_\_\_ as  
U.S. Application Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_  
and was amended on \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ was filed on \_\_\_\_\_ as  
International PCT Application Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_  
and was amended on \_\_\_\_\_.

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above-identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, CFR § 1.56.

I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States code, § 119(a)-(d) or § 365(b) of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate, or § 365(a) of any PCT International application which designated at least one country other than the United States, listed below and have identified below, by checking the box, any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate, or PCT International application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

**Prior Foreign Application(s)**

Priority Benefits Claimed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Appl. No.) (Country) (Filing Date)

☐ Yes ☐ No

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Appl. No.) (Country) (Filing Date)

☐ Yes ☐ No

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Appl. No.) (Country) (Filing Date)

I hereby claim the benefit under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) of any United States provisional application(s) listed below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Application Serial No.) (Filing Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Application Serial No.) (Filing Date)

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, § 120 of any United States application(s), or § 365(c) of any PCT International application designating the United States, listed below and, insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States or PCT International application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35, United States Code, § 112, I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to patentability as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56 which became available between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:

Prior U.S. Application(s)

(Application Serial No.)

(Filing Date)

(Status - patented, pending, abandoned)

(Application Serial No.)

(Filing Date)

(Status - patented, pending, abandoned)

And I hereby appoint the following patent attorney/agents, including **Kevin J. Zilka (Reg. No. 41,429); and Brian J. Daiuto (Reg. No. 38,422)** as my principal attorneys to prosecute this application and to transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith:

Send Correspondence To:

**Kevin J. Zilka**  
**P.O. BOX 721030**  
**San Jose, California 95172-1030**

Direct Telephone Calls To:

**Kevin J. Zilka at telephone number (408) 505-5100**

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Typewritten Full Name of  
Sole or First Inventor:

Lee Benzinger

Citizenship: U.S.

Inventor's signature:

*Lee Benzinger*

Date of Signature: May 11, 2000

Residence: (City)

San Jose

(State/Country) California/USA

Post Office Address:

429 Camille Circle #15, San Jose CA 95134

Full Name of Second Joint  
Inventor (if any):

Richard J. Feiertag

Citizenship: USA

Inventor's signature:

*Richard Feiertag*

Date of Signature: May 11, 2000

Residence: (City)

Mountain View

(State/Country) California/USA

Post Office Address:

3406 Churin Drive, Mountain View, CA 94040

Full Name of Third Joint  
Inventor (if any):

Jaisook Rho

Citizenship: USA

Inventor's signature:

*Jaisook Rho*

Date of Signature: May 11, 2000

Residence: (City)

Palo Alto

(State/Country) California/USA

Post Office Address:

785 Coastland Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303